ENT 224257

BEFORE THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SEMINOLE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE INC. : Petitioner
vs : CASE NO: 42110
CSX TRANSPORTATION INC. (CSXT) : Respondent

1. Mitchell Williams motions this Board to include the attached Friend of the Board brief. Mr. Williams' interest in the instant case is as a buyer of the electricity produced by the petitioner Seminole Electric Cooperative Inc.

FRIEND OF THE BOARD BRIEF OF MITCHELL WILLIAMS
IN SUPPORT OF CSXT

2. The complaint of Seminole Electric makes certain assumptions that are false. They are as follows;

a. Because Seminole has burned coal in its power plant in the past it must burn coal forever.

b. Because Seminole has received coal shipments by CSXT trains in the past they cannot receive economic shipments of coal by any other method.

3. To refute assumption a. Mitchell Williams includes Appendix A. and B. to this brief. To refute assumption b. Mitchell Williams shows that Seminole's Palatka powerplant is only a few hundred yards from the St. Johns River in Putnam County. There is no restriction for them to receive all coal [illegible] shipments. Waterborne shipments are normally cheaper than rail. Coal received from South Africa by water should be cheaper than any coal in this country.

Respectfully submitted

Mitchell Williams

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[illegible]

[illegible] Electric Cooperative, Inc.
c/o Robert [illegible], [illegible], P.A.
20[illegible] S. [illegible] Ave., Suite 100
Tampa, Florida 33[illegible]

CSX Transportation, Inc.
500 Water Street
Jacksonville, Florida 3[illegible]

This 6 [illegible] DECEMBER, [illegible].

Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams
17[illegible] [illegible] Ave.
Palatka, Florida [illegible]
386 [illegible]

No. 08-5187

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MITCHELL WILLIAMS — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

BILL PHILLIPS, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MITCHELL WILLIAMS
(Your Name)

1707 Rutland Ave.
(Address)

Palatka, FL 3[illegible]177
(City, State, Zip Code)

[illegible]
(Phone Number)

appendix A.

JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether a contract for electric power service includes an implied contract by the power company to accept reasonable alternative payments for up to 50% of an electric power bill?

2. Whether dry wood, dry goat manure, or live goats are a reasonable alternative payment for service provided by a coal burning powerplant?

3. Whether a trial court judge abuses his discretion by not recuseing himself from acting on any issue that has been previously appealed?

4. Whether an appeals court abuses its discretion by refusing to accept an offered affadavit of indigency?

5. Whether Rule 9.430 is facially unconstitutional as applied to the facts of this case?

6. Whether there exists an equitable duty for a county that issues citations for electric service to assume a significant percentage of the cost of providing such service and to promptly clean up trash left on the Petitioner's land by county residents?

7. Whether Respondents are in violation of their charter from the Federal Rural Electrifacation Commission to provide service to farms and ranchs when they charge grossly inflated prices to connect electric power, charges that are not applied to any known neighbor?

8. Whether an appeals court abuses its discretion when it denies consolidation of cases from the two cases have parties and issues in common?

LIST OF PARTIES

[ ] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[X] All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

BILL PHILLIPS

CLAY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE INC.

CATHY JENKINS

SEMINOLE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE INC.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX TO APPENDICES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

Rule 9.430. Proceedings by Indigents.

A party who has the right to seek review without payment of costs shall file a motion in the lower tribunal, with an affidavit showing the party's inability either to pay fees and costs or to give security therefor. If the motion is granted, the party may proceed without further application to the court and without either the prepayment of fees or costs in the lower tribunal or court or the giving of security therefor. If the motion is denied, the lower tribunal shall state in writing the reasons therefor. Review shall be by motion filed in the court.

An appellate court may, in its discretion, presume that an incarcerated party who has been declared indigent for purposes of proceedings in the lower tribunal remains indigent, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[ ] reported at _____; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[X] is unpublished.

The opinion of the SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[ ] reported at _____; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[X] is unpublished.

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was MAY 22, 2008. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A_____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

ARTICLE I. Section 10

,Or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts,

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution,of certain rights,shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. The Court will be encouraged to know that the many references to "coke" in this case, have nothing to do with cocaine. This may well be a case of first impression.

2. It may be well for the petitioner to first explain a few facts about fire. Facts that are not obvious. There are basicly only two kinds of fire, oxidizing fire or reducing fire, and under some conditions steam can be made to burn.

3. Sometime late in the evening you might make a medium size bonfire in the back yard with waste wood and enjoy a cookout. When the fire is first burning well you will notice that it burns with a bright yellow flame that lights up the area. If a sudden gust of wind should smother the flames or if you throw a blanket over the fire and cut off all air you will see a thick cloud of smoke coming out of the hot wood. Touch this smoke with a lit match and the flames will often jump up just as before. The bright flameing fire is an oxidizing fire, and the smoldering, smokey fire is a reducing fire.

4. Now if you continue to sit by the fire and don't constantly add more wood the fire will start to die down and produce much less light. Instead of the bright yellow flame you will notice that now the flames are a red mixed with blue that produces much less light. If you continue to wait until the fire is only a pile of burning charcoal even the red will disappear and leave only flecks of blue light that dance around over the fire. After this a bright charcoal fire may still exist for several hours with no flame at all, however just add some more dry wood and soon the bright flames will start all over again.

5. When carbon burns completely to carbon dioxide it burns with a yellow flame and is [illegible]. If air supply is [illegible] reduced hot carbon cannot combine with enough oxygen to produce carbon dioxide and so carbon monoxide is formed instead. Carbon dioxide will not burn because combustion is complete. However carbon monoxide is a highly explosive, and poisonous gas that when burning gently (over the bonfire) normally burns with a red flame mixed with blue. As long as the carbon monoxide is burning it normally causes no harm. The last stage of the fire is the most dangerous. When it has died down to the stage that only little flecks of blue light are dancing around over the fire you are now watching hydrogen burn. How can this happen? All hydrocarbons have long since been driven out of the wood by the hot fire, and only charcoal is now burning. Soil moisture under the fire is now turning to steam. Since hot steam is much lighter than air it rises through the bed of charcoal. Hot carbon now steals the atoms of oxygen away from the steam and produces a mixture of hydrogen gas and carbon monoxide gas both explosive and highly poisonous. This was called Blau Gaz (Blue Gas) by the Germans and was used to fill the fuel cells on the GRAF ZEPPLIN which was the most successful of all hydrogen filled airships. The name came from the fact that it burned with a blue flame. This gas burns perfectly in gasoline engines and the publisher converted an old [illegible] to run on it back in [illegible].

6. Old [illegible] of years ago [illegible] fire that emitted vast amounts of soot and carbon [illegible] into the atmosphere, this caused a [illegible] waste of fuel. Present [illegible]

powerplants operate on the hottest oxidizing fire possible to stop the fuel waste.

7. Conventional steam powered electric powerplants often use coal as the fuel. This is a widely available, fairly cheap fuel whose main disadvantage is that unless close to the surface of the ground is very dangerous to mine. One pound of coal is a piece about the size of your fist and has about 13,000 British Thermal Units of energy (B.T.U.s). A piece of dry oak having the same B.T.U. content would be about twice as large, pine about three times, and dry hay about half a square bale. Although chunks of coal were once used (and prefered) for use in steam trains, this is rarely seen in electric powerplants today. Instead the coal is ground into a fine powder so that it will burn extremely quickly and at the highest temperature possible. This increases fuel economy. Powerplants that burn wood, hay, and stubble rarely powder the fuel because of the tough fiberous nature of the fuel. Chipping is normally enough, although some plants will still use large chunks. Green or soaked wood is not as good a fuel in a powerplant. Although it will burn it wastes a lot of the energy in the wood just drying itself out. This causes increased smoke, soot, and buildup of creosote in chimneys. A chipping and drying process before burning greatly improves the fuel value of green wood. Paper mills only want fresh cut green wood, but powerplants would much rather have long dead and dried wood.

8. In todays powerplants it takes about one pound of coal to produce one kilowatt hour of electric power, and this releases about 3/4 of a pound of CO_2 into the air. The rest is water vapor and ash which small but harmfull amounts of sulfuric acid [illegible]

acid gases. Also there is a [illegible] amount of mercury in the smoke from coal. Even very small amounts of mercury are very dangerous. By contrast wood, hay, and stubble produce almost no sulfuric acid, or mercury. If burned at the same high temperatures as coal <u>WITH AIR</u> they will produce just as much nitric acid as coal because the acid is formed when the nitrogen in air combines with oxygen. Strangely this nitric acid (also formed by lightning) is helpful to plants as it provides nitrogen to plants that, unlike legumes, cannot fix nitrogen themselves.

9. It has always been possible for coal burning power-stations to switch to burning wood, hay, or stubble (hereinafter biomas) because of emergencies, or to stretch supplies of coal. The same can be said for powerplants that burn oil, gas or whatever. They can also all burn together as they do in a garbage burning powerplant. Why is it that mostly biomas burning power-plants are rare except in heavy timber regions with low populations or at papermills?

10. What (for example) would it take to convert Respondent Seminole Electric's 1200 Megawatt Palatka powerplant to burn biomas only? They would need to find a local timber contractor that owns or controls one millon acres of timberland. They would need to start [illegible] 300 or [illegible] acres per [illegible] to [illegible] the furnaces. This would arrive as the less desirable green wood and would need a wood [illegible] process before burning. The local Georgia-Pacific Papermill would be [illegible] of the green wood they need. All, so many of the local residents can turn the inside of their house into a cool day in Canada instead of a steam bath in Florida.

11. This would be such a stupid idea that Petitioner doubts that it has ever been seriously considered. Large timber areas would start looking like the surface of the Moon. A closely related effect actually WAS happened in Sub-Saharan Africa, but it was done by people, goats and sheep with a few cows, camels and donkeys.

12. All that being said, it is a well known fact that in temperate areas like Florida that recieve reasonable amounts of rain all year; You can cut one acre out of each 52 acres that you own and if you replant it your supply of wood remains constant. Wood is regrowing as fast as it is being cut. This is known as the annual sustainable yield.

13. However when you look at this problem in terms of the real life cycle of trees then the picture changes dramaticly. Trees are blown down by storms, killed by beetles, killed by wild fires, droughts, and flooding, hit by trucks, harvested for paper pulp, poles, and lumber. Many of the dead trees are allowed to rot where they fall. If a large portion of the storm downed trees from our 2004 hurricanes had been sent to Seminole Electric's powerplant it could have run for two or three months on wood alone. What DID happen to those trees? The true story is quite amusing. A company named WASTE PRO has the present contract to dispose of waste in our county. The dump is about 3 miles away from Seminole's powerplant. Here is what happened. People paid a small amount to haul whole [illegible] trees. This formed a huge pile. However next to the pile was a huge size wood chipper mounted on a semi-truck trailer.

[illegible] mill. [illegible] driven to [illegible] county and sold to their [illegible] plant to be burned for power. The only possible situation that could have been more absurd than this would have been if [illegible] also had the contract for that county, chipped up their trees, brought them to Palatka and sold them to Seminole. All at the same time. The man that runs the wood chipper told the Petitioner about this when they met. When he was asked what would happen if Seminole started allowing clients to pay up to half of their electric bill with waste wood he agreed that most waste wood would stop coming to the chip, "It won't be any problem at all because they will [illegible] their trees"!

17. It is all because of just such irresponsible excesses that power company officials have such a contemptable attitude to biomass use. They feel that it is just worthless trash and they should be PAID just to take it. When it seems to be of help to their business they can, however, crow loudly about their use of renewable energy. Witness below a flyer recieved on the day that the Petitioner typed up this brief;

Renewables now meet about 4% of the energy needs of Seminole Electric's member systems, which includes Clay Electric. Seminole's renewable resources include biomass and waste-to-energy plants and landfill gas facilities (among the most reliable forms of renewable energy). While wind and sun are *free* fuels, they are weather-dependent: the sun doesn't always shine and the wind may come and go. For example, the Florida Solar Center says solar panels can be counted on to produce energy only 17% of the time. In contrast, most of the power plants that Seminole uses to meet Clay's needs can produce power about 90% of the time, and their fuels or alternate fuels are always available since they can be stockpiled or stored on the plant sites

Power Line is an informative publication of Clay Electric Cooperative, Inc. It is distributed monthly with members' billing statements. If you have questions or comments about the Power Line publication, contact Editor Wayne Mattox at P.O. Box 308, Keystone Heights, FL 32656, or e-mail WMattox@clayelectric.com

Clay Electric also publishes the Kilowatt four times a year (January, March, July and October). [illegible] since 1948 as [illegible] member.

Clay Electric's web site (http://www.clayelectric.com) offers [illegible] about the co-op's [illegible] services. Members can [illegible] their own ads [illegible] published on the web site's Trading Post [illegible] Clay Electric account number [illegible] statement.

Clay Electric's Board of Trustees will meet on May 22 and June 19 beginning at 2:30 p.m. in Keystone Heights.

15. It was helpful to the Petitioner's case in the Supreme Court of the State of Florida for the Respondents to include evidence not yet requested by the Petitioner. They included a copy of the service contract,telephone conversation and hand written letter to Clay Electric. S.C.U.S. Appendix F It would be equally helpful in this case for them to send in any evidence that they might have that would show that they had no part in the scam regarding the 2004 tree disposal. It would be a serious violation of public trust if it could be shown that though they refuse to credit their clients for their waste trees they are willing to pay cash to third parties that can trick them out of them,and move them to another county. They need to show exactly where the renewable fuels came from after the 2004 storms.It is high time for electric power companies to stop treating customers as if they are ignorant,helpless fools that should be grateful that they don't just leave them in the dark with a candle and a fan.

16. It would appear that if it was possible to gather all annual wastage of vegetation in this area (dead limbs,trees,leaves, pine cones,grass and weeds) there would be several times more fuel than would be needed to operate all powerplants.

As regards the conduct of this case in the lower courts these are the main events; Petitioner filed his complaint and request for an injunction on August 6,2007 with a declaration of indigency and a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. This motion was denied on procedural grounds on August 16th

2007. A motion for reconsideration was filed on August 20, 2007 including an affadavit of indigency. this was also denied on August 24, 2007. Notice of appeal was filed on August 30,2007. Petitioner then sent an affidavit of indigency and an appeal brief with a motion to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis. The appeals court refused to accept this filing and sent it back to the Petitioner with the ORDER OF THE COURT dated September 12,2007. Petitioner no longer has a copy of that motion and brief because he later sent it back to them with a paper they had requested and that time they kept it .
The Florida District Courts of Appeal have a [illegible] rule that relieves them of any need to rule on a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. They only need to review by motion rulings on this subject sent up by the trial court. The problem with this case is that the in forma pauperis denial was exactly what was being appealed. RULE 9.430 of the Florida Rules of Appealate Procedure. The appeals court only needs to affirm or deny the lower courts ruling on the subject.On November 29, 2007 they affirmed the lower court ruling denying IFP status on appeal. Petitioner imediately sent a motion for in extraordinary writ with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

17. This was instantly docketed in the Supreme Court of Florida and set for briefing. As this Court can see the Florida Supreme Court ruling was the only one to rule in any way concerning the merits of the case, and as the ruling shows they state that the complaint does not allege any illegal conduct on the Respondents part. This conclusion is what this petition seeks to disprove.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

18. The Florida Supreme Court ruling states in effect that the Petitioner has not in fact alleged that the Respondents had broken any stated law, and the Petitioner at first found this to be a real problem. He has no access to a good law library in Palatka (unlike in Atlanta) and was stumped. Not to worry. Petitioner is a great follower of Jeremy Bentham's idea that the law can be DISCOVERED. Petitioner's past cases concerning abortion prove to this Court that he is able to discover a LOT of law.

19. The Respondents are in violation of an implied contract when they refuse to accept a reasonable alternative payment for their electric services. They cannot provide any electric service without fuel and the fuel offered is far better than the fuel they use. The Petitioner offered about $9 more than the bill he owed in cash. The only real problem is that he has no trailer to take the wood to the powerplant (about 10 miles away). This should allow them about 20% more wood for picking it up. The coal doesn't come from Virginia by rail for free. They also don't need to pick it up right after a heavy rain when the wood is heavy. The wood offered, when burned, would produce close to twice as much energy as the Petitioner actually used. This allows other clients to benefit from the sustainable energy produced.

20. If the Petitioner has a reasonable right to enforcement of this implied contract then every electric client also has that right. Power companies only selling [illegible] power, solar, hydro and wind will not be exempt. They must trade for up to [illegible]% of the electric bill. If they like they could then sell, burn themselves for power or turn it all into methanol to sell as an automobile

fuel. In a few years about 3[illegible]% of all power east of the Mississippi would come from waste wood. Many thousands of automobiles, trucks tractors and even airplanes would run on nothing but methanol made from biomas or coal.

21. The day that this Court rules in the Petitioner's favor the oil industry and OPEC will experience the biggest business shock in history.

22. The Petitioner's complaint is self explanatory and the Petitioner has tried to include a copy of all relevant papers filed in this case. S.C.U.S. Appendix [illegible]

23. The Petitioner's case does not seek to force Respondents to pay cash for waste trees or to stop buying coal. They will however need to accept all suitable fuels offered by their clients before they are at liberty to bargain with outsiders to buy their needed fuels with the money given to them by their clients. The basic value rate for the biomas will need to be set by the adverage value of the competing fuel sources.

24. The Court will be encouraged to know that this case will not need to raise any criticism about judge made law. The Court can justly deny judge made law and point to the Petitioner and say "Hey, this isn't judge made law. This is [illegible] made law"!

25. The Petitioner is well aware that fuel costs are rarely more than 5 or 10% of the actual cost of electric service. No reason for allowing clients to pay more than this exists; 10% is an easy number to remember and calculate. Many clients have no source of biomas and will not be able to benefit directly. Some clients, like

timber companies, home builders etc. will have many as [illegible] times as much waste wood as their electric bill. These customers should be allowed to deliver the waste wood to the powerplants and then sell credits to people that have no waste biomass. A few people will just want cash for their biomass and the powerplants are free to offer them anything they are willing to pay for it. If at some future date clients are offering more biomass than the powerplant can ever burn then it would be reasonable to consider lowering the percentage of the bill that the client can pay with fuel. One good reason to allow a inetial first right to pay 50% of the electric bill with biomass is to start out the program with a bang. Very small percentages would not get any quick action.

26. In all previous paradigms of electric power generation for the public there has been a jealous desire of each of the various methods to dominate the market. Seeking to belittle and exclude each other from the market they fight like dogs not realizing that different methods work best in different places. In the desert southwest power companies must be forced to buy surplus solar power their clients produce, wind power in the north west, tide, wave and hydro in the north east. In America's heartland they need to start right now getting ready to buy (or at least trade) for cow poop power. The idea that oil should be pumped out of the ground half a world away, shipped to our town to power [illegible] the market is a [illegible] idea that this case will [illegible]. Some electric [illegible] [illegible]. They should be encouraged to do so as a defense to the wild market swings of commercial fuel. Instead of trying to monopolize a local power source, power

countries will [illegible] be [illegible] the land from [illegible].

17. Whether waste biomass is used to augment the energy needs of this country, or not, the Court can be sure that biomass will become so. A local incident should be instructive to the Court. A short distance south of the Petitioner's farm is an 8 or 9 hundred acre tree farm owned by the Alford family. Two years ago it was decided that it was getting too thickly overgrown and a fire danger. Men and machines moved in. In two weeks, extra trees were cut and carried off to the paper mill. Two areas in the farm were cleared for the burning pile. These piles had all the tops cut off from the trees and other waste. The two piles were about 120 feet long, 50 feet wide, and 30 feet high. The energy locked in these piles was each equal to at least one 40 ton coal car.

Since this was done the area, formerly hard to enter, is now open. Deer, goats, and turkeys go wild eating on the better than normal food, caused by the fresh regrowth. The piles sat untouched until a few months ago. One day recently when the wind was not too strong someone went out there and cut a fresh fire lane around the piles and the farm. Then they set fire to one of the two piles. The Petitioner saw the fire from a distance and thought that the tree farm had caught fire. Later he saw that it was just one of the piles. During the several hours that it took for that pile to burn down it was releasing as much energy as one of Seminole's two furnaces. All to waste. A week later the other pile was burned. All over this timber region these piles are burned in fair weather. This was just the first time the Petitioner had seen it close up.

18. Lest the Petitioner's case paint too rosy a picture of the new world of energy realities, please remember that this

will open up a whole new realm for fraud and theft. No good idea has ever been made that a crook couldn't find a criminal angle.

29. This case would probably never have come before any court if the Putnam County Zoning Board had not served the Petitioner with the attached Notice of Violation. County Zoning boards in many farm states long ago learned not to give farmers citations. They found that if any work needed to be done the county would have to pay for it. With this case the Respondents are learning this lesson the hard way. Putnam County STILL has not cleaned up the thousands of beer bottles, cans, and old tires etc. left by county residents on the Petitioner's land before he moved to it. Where this junk gets in the way the Petitioner has, however raked it into piles. He has even sold the aluminum cans. S.C.U.S. Appendix E

30. In addition county zone enforcement boards need to be taught that overzealous code enforcement can cost the county funds as well as the public. Code enforcement is often used as an instrument to feed neighborhood feuds. One neighbor does not like the look of another's outhouse, etc. When the Petitioner's electric line was put up they would have been wise to stop bothering the Petitioner about his trailer. Almost everyone in this area lives in one form of trailer or another, but they would not stop trying to get a fine. S.C.U.S. Appendix E

Such an effort on their part puts them in serious violation of the TURNIP STATUTE. Which reads in relevant part; You cannot squeeze blood out of a turnip.

CONCLUSION

31. The present energy crisis is one that we cannot drill for oil out of, or dig for coal out of. However the realization is that much of the energy many people need is rotting in the back yard. This is the largest untapped pool of energy on Earth and it is a pool that, unlike oil, can grow back.

32. Militant environmentalists decry carbon base fuels and fix their hopes on the ethereal songs of a hydrogen economy.. OPEC is only slightly more worried about hydrogen than it is in liquified moonbeams. We can be very glad that much energy is carbon based because that is the one element that makes it possible to burn steam, and make alcohol. The quantum leaps made possible with the uses of nearly pure oxygen in place of air will greatly improve the fuel economy of vehicles and powerplants. Many will regret their haste to have that large dead tree in the back yard cut down and carried away.

33. Since the Petitioners plans are for an active market in waste biomas, then it would seem reasonable for the power-plants to set their own rates for electric power. The only thing demanded is that power companies not be fools buying through the back door wood chips that they are unwilling to trade for through the front door. Most homeowners have not woke up to the fact that the unsightly waste tree is, in fact, prime fuel for generation, or turning into methanol for auto fuel. It will [illegible] killed or injured by falling trees, chainsaws or smoke. For a while the [illegible] will have a field day.

3. A few years ago it was decided that the Federal Government should unleash the power of the farmers to help drive down the price of fuel. The way this has been done has been a colossal disaster that has meant hunger for countless millions from sky high food costs. Millions of tons of perfectly good food and feed corn is taken to make auto fuel with a 51 cent per gallon subsidy for ethanol. Petitioner argues that farm [illegible] greatly, help in relieving the fuel crisis. But not farm PRODUCTION. Many types of spoiled grain,rotten fruits,and vegetables are suitable for making into ethanol and should be. Recently however the rotten grains of corn have turned up in the 39 bags of corn that the Petitioner buys at the feed store. He takes them back. This problem has been so bad that the Petitioner has needed to see the inside of the bags before he buys them. Farmers should be the first to burn ethanol made from waste crops but it won't happen with subsidies for corn. It will happen with a $1 or $2 tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.This case shows the Court that the farmers do have the energy, but they must not be hampered from using it.

3. The Court can remedy the gross errors made below by just sending it down with orders to consolidate it with the Respondent's appeal. Don't use the judge made law.Use the Featherdon only law. Remember it is only Jesus that can show effective mercy to the fool. **The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.**

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Williams

Date: July 7, 08

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

PUTNAM COUNTY

STATE OF FLORIDA

MITCHELL WILLIAMS

Plaintiff

vs

BILL PHILLIPS, individualy and in his capacity as director of Clay Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Cathy Jenkins, as agent for Putnam County Seminole Electric Cooperative Inc.

Defendents

CIVIL CASE # 10707

The original of this copy received and filed in Putnam County, office Of the Clerk of County Court.

By _____ D.C.

Date 03-06-2007 11:15

COMPLAINT

I. Background of the Case

1. After living in his trailer with his flock of goats for about two years the Plaintiff sought to get electric service to his property. He ran a 650 ft. extension cord to an old power pole and had service turned on. This extension cord cost about $185 and worked well for about two years, but was not strictly assembled to comply with building codes.

2. On October 10,2006 the plaintiff recieved a citation from the code enforcement department demanding that he stop using the extension cord. He agreed with code enforcement officials that it would be far better to have normal electric service connected to his property rather than use the extension cord. They did not offer to help pay for such a change.

3. Clay Electric Cooperative Inc. cheerfully agreed

to install a new service line, but they demanded a payment of $6000 that they would finance over ten years. They informed the Plaintiff that they would need to recieve a cash payment of $470 Putnam County TAX before they could start work. The new line was then put up. It required six new poles, a transformer, and about two city blocks of double wire. Only one of these poles is actually on the Plaintiff's property. A certain amount of underbrush was cleared to make a clean right of way.

4. It has worked well since it was connected but not actually a lot better than the previous extension cord. There has not been any extreme change in the monthly use of electricity but there has been an extreme change in the monthly electric bill. From $25 to $90 or more per month.

5. This increase has been an unbearable economic burden on a small farm.

6. At the beginning of July 2007 the Plaintiff recieved the disputed bill. This is attached as Appendix A.On July 21 the Plaintiff sent a letter to Clay Electric Cooperative Inc. with a payment of $34.58 for electricity and other charges, but no payment in cash offered for the line extension.The letter noted that it was impossible at this time to pay in cash for the line extension, but could be paid in the produce of the farm. The plaintiff offered to exchange one $75 goat or two $35 goats, or one $65 goat with a baby (none less than 2 months old at this Time) for the $66.51 line extension principle and intrest.

7. An alternative payment of $75 worth of dry wood to burn in the power plant was offered. Plaintiff noted that he no longer needs coal to be brought in to make his electric power while there is spare wood to offer.

8. On July 24,2007 a man hand delivered the card (attached as Appendix B) to the plaintiff demanding that he pay the full $119.09 in 24 hours or risk having his electric service cut off.

II. ARGUMENT

9. The $470 tax and the $6000 connection charge are an unconscinably excessive fee for a nesscessary service to a small goat farm. Electric service is not a luxury,but a vital requirement to farm operation and sanitary food storage. It cannot be cut off because of utility companies refusal to accept alternative payment offers. It is perfectly idiotic to require Florida electric customers to pay all of their bills in cash when they have more than enough waste wood to pay half of their bill in wood. Wood is a renewable fuel source low in sulfur.

10. The Plaintiff disconnected the home made extension cord and had a normal connection put in its place as demanded by Putnam County Code officials. It is quite unreasonable for them to then demand the Plaintiff to pay a $470 tax(plus $50 for a building permit) to allow him to put up a normal connection. They should be obliged to refund $300 of the tax and $25 of building permit for complying with their requirements.

It may be instructive to the Court to consider the fact that in many "Farm States" building codes do not apply to farms

and ranchs. In those states local officials have found that the best way to avoid having to pay themselves for the cost of bringing farms "up to code" is to ignore it.

11. Defendent Phillips as manager of an electric cooperative is able to to recieve payments from the Federal Rural Electrafication Commission for much of the expense of extending electric service out to farms and ranchs. This Court should rule that the Plaintiff should only need pay for the work and pole actually done on his property.

12. This Court should also rule that the alternative payment offered cannot be refused for up to 50% of a monthly bill.

13. WHEREFORE the Plaintiff prays and demands that he be refunded at least $325 by Putnam County and be charged by Clay Electric Cooperative Inc. only for the work and pole actually put on his property and be allowed to pay up to 50% of his monthly bill with the produce of his farm. In addition the Plaintiff requests that a Temporary Injunction issue to Clay Electric Cooperative injoining them from disconnecting the Plaintiff's electric service during the pendency of the instant case.

THIS 6 DAY OF AUGUST, 2007

Respectfully Submitted

Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams Pro Se
1707 Rutland Ave.
Palatka, Florida 32177
386 546-3222

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

OF PUTNAM COUNTY

STATE OF FLORIDA

MITCHELL WILLIAMS
Plaintiff

vs

BILL PHILLIPS, et al
Defendents

CIVIL CASE #

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION OF FACTS

Comes now the Plaintiff Mitchell Williams requesting that the following facts be admitted as true, subject to any valid objection that may be entered at trial.

1. Steam plants that burn fuel can operate on almost any non-toxic fuel.

2. Local fuels cost less to transport to the power plant than distant fuels.

3. Wood contains less sulfur than coal and is renewable.

4. Wood burned with pure oxygen, and superheated steam would produce much less greenhouse gases than coal burned with air only.

5. The Federal Government has for many years paid a large portion of the expense of running electric service out to farms and ranchs.

Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams Pro Se

1707 Rutland Ave

Palatka,fla 32177

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

OF PUTNAM COUNTY

STATE OF FLORIDA

MITCHELL WILLIAMS
Plaintiff
vs
BILL PHILLIPS, et al
Defendents

CIVIL CASE-
_____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that I have this day served a copy of the within and foregoing COMPLAINT and REQUEST FOR AN INJUNCTION on Defendents BILL PHILLIPS,CATHY JENKINS,and SEMINOLE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE INC. by United States Mail properly addressed and with sufficient postage to assure delivery.

This 6 day of August,2007

Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams Pro Se
1707 Rutland Ave
Palatka,Florida 32177
386 546-3222

APP. A

Clay Electric Cooperative, Inc
PALATKA DISTRICT OFFICE
300 N STATE ROAD 19
PALATKA, FL 32177
386-328-1432

A Touchstone Energy® Cooperative

Statement Date 6/26/2007

Web Address: clayelectric.com
E-Mail: service@clayelectric.com
Automated Outage Reporting Line: (888) 434-9844

Customer	Name	Service Address	Meter	Multiplier
551764-4	WILLIAMS MITCHELL	1707 RUTLAND AVE/GOAT FARM	25-203-015	1

Rate - D	From	To	Approx Next Read Date	Previous	Present	KWH	Days	Daily KWH
GEN SERVICE-NON DEMAND	5/24/2007	6/25/2007	7/26/2007	925	1169	244	32	8

Previous Statement Balance	**114.83**	
6/18/2007 Payment Received - Thank You	114.83CR	
Previous Balance		$.00
Current Charges Billed 6/26/2007		
ENERGY	17.93	
CUSTOMER CHARGE	9.00	
CONTRACT BAL 5,792.68 LINE EXTENSION PRINCIPAL	36.58	
LINE EXTENSION INTEREST	29.93	
POWER COST ADJUSTMENT .01760 X 244 KWH	4.29	
FLA GROSS RECEIPTS TAX	.80	
FLORIDA SALES TAX - (PUTNAM)	2.24	
PUTNAM COUNTY SALES TAX	.32	
Current Charges Due on 7/12/2007		$101.09
Total Amount Due		$101.09

Government Taxes/Fees are not imposed by Clay Electric - $3.36

Please see the enclosed Power Line brochure for information that the co-op needs from you if you should report an inoperative or malfunctioning outdoor light on Clay Electric's lines.

A late charge of $3.00 or 1 1/2 percent of the delinquent amount (whichever is greater) will [illegible] payment in full is not received within 24 days of billing

APPENDIX. A

APPENDIX B

COURTESY NOTICE

DO-244 12/01/03

[illegible] notice is only left the first time an account is on collection

[illegible] your electric bill has not been received.

[illegible] check (amount shown below) has been returned.

[illegible] amount shown below by 8:00 a.m./p.m. (a.m. circled) on 7/25, 2007, in the district office [illegible] payment. By making prompt payment, you will avoid the inconvenience [illegible] electric service disconnected and the additional charges that would occur.

Electric bill (includes late charges)	104.09
Returned Check (Cash Only)	
Returned Check Charge ($25 or 5% of check up to $50)	
Service Charge	$15
TOTAL AMOUNT	$119.09

[illegible] Collector [illegible]

Date 7/24 Time 9:35 a.m./p.m.

[illegible] (circled) [illegible] | Keystone Hts. 473-4917 | Lake City 752-7447 | Toll Free 1-800-224-4917

History of (tacts for Customer 5517 * Status *

Name WILLIAMS MITCHELL Phone No. 386 _.6 3222

2=Modify Entry 3=Complete 4=Trans Supr 5=Trans Rep 6=Cancel S/O ...

Opt	Date	CMP	Customer Contacts	S/O	LT
10	8/07/2007	C		NG	L N N N N
__	3/05/2007	C	Notes	ILL:	Y Y N N
__	3/05/2007	C	SPOKE TO MBR CONCERNING LETTER. MBR OFFE	ACT	Y Y N N
__	2/01/2007	C	RED TO TRADE GOATS/WOOD/MANURE FOR ELECT		N N N N

RIC SERVICE. I EXPLAINED TO MBR WE COULD NOT ACCEPT THESE ITEMS IN EXCHANGE FOR ELECTRIC SERVICE. I GAVE MBR ASSISTANCE INFORMATION (SREC TO PY JLY BILL). I TOL D MBR I WOULD INFORM MR. THOMPSON. I EXP LAINED TO MBR WE WOULD BE IN SIMILAR SIT UATION NEXT MONTH IF HE CONTINUED TO REF USE TO PAY LINE EXTENSION PRINCIPAL AND +

F12=Cancel

F2=Outs. Entries F3=Exit F6=New Entry F11=Fold/Unfold F12=Return F17=Hist
F18=Disp by Prop F20=Link F21=Prt Hist F22=Prt Credit F23=Status F24=Opt

History of tacts for Customer 5517 * Status *

Name WILLIAMS MITCHELL Phone No. 386 46 3222

2=Modify Entry 3=Complete 4=Trans Supr 5=Trans Rep 6=Cancel S/O ...

Opt	Date	CMP		S/O	LT
10	8/07/2007	C	Customer Contacts	NG	L N N N N
__	3/05/2007	C	Notes	ILL:	Y Y N N
__	3/05/2007	C	INTEREST. CONVERSATION OCCURED AT APPROX	ACT	Y Y N N
__	2/01/2007	C	. 8AM 7/26/07 (25 MINUTE CONVERSATION).		N N N N

DH

+

F12=Cancel

F2=Outs. Entries F3=Exit F6=New Entry F11=Fold/Unfold F12=Return F17=Hist
F18=Disp by Prop F20=Link F21=Prt Hist F22=Prt Credit F23=Status F24=Opt

Re: Present electric power bill

I am a full time goat farmer and only recieve $318 per month of social security payments. It is not possible to pay bills over $100 per month for electricity at a time when corn is $7 per bag. What is worse is that I sold no goats this past month. Until conditions improve I will no longer be able to send payment for the line extension principle and intrest in cash, but could pay with products. This is the whole reason for farming.

The easiest way would be to let you have one $75 goat, or two $35 goats. You could also recieve instead one $65 with a baby (none less than 2 months old at this time). I have no way of delivering anything at the present moment so you would need to send someone by to pick them up.

An alternate method of payment would be fuel to ~~b~~ burn to make electricity. I don't need coal any more to be shipped in to make my electricity. I have plenty of fuel (dry wood or dry goat manure). These are very low in sulfer. You could deliver ~~$~~ $75 worth of fuel to Seminole to burn for my electric power.

The main problem is to estimate the proper amount of dry wood that will replace $75 worth of coal.

The proper way to estimate this amount is to assume that dry wood has a B.T.U. content only about half that of coal. (but a higher hydrogen to carbon content meaning lower greenhouse gas output)

If coal sells for $140 per ton (it may be less) then it would take 2142 pounds of dry wood to equal $75 worth coal.

I have the wood (or manure which is not as good a fuel) available right now and you can pick it up at any time. You will however need an accurate weight scale on your pick up truck to make sure that I don't overpay with wood. You can make an appointment by calling 386 546-3222

Yours Truly

Mitchell Williams

or... you might also get Rural Electrification to pay for the line extension

AGREEM. T FOR MEMBER SERVICE L TENSION

Agreement made Dec 13th , 20 06 between CLAY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., (hereinafter called the Seller) and WILLIAMS, MITCHELL (hereinafter called the Consumer).

Witnesseth: That in consideration of the Seller making service available to the Customer, the Customer agrees as follows:

1 To pay monthly charges based on the appropriate rate schedule; plus a monthly charge of $66.51 for aid to construct line extension, which is in accordance with Seller's line extension charge policy.

2 Facilities for which the service is requested will be wired and ready for service prior to construction of extension.

3. The Customer is responsible for notifying the Seller if any conditions affecting the line extension charge change.

This agreement shall become effective on the date service is first made available by the Seller to the Customer and shall remain in effect for a period of TEN (10) years or until new customers are added to the extension.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed all as of the date and year first above written.

CLAY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
Seller

WITNESS Teresa Driggers By
District Manager

WITNESS By
Customer

CEC-ENG-2210 6/98

CLAY ELECTRIC CO 'ERATIVE, INC. 12/13/2006

5 5 cty
7% + 1% 8% - Putnam
7½% - Volusia
8% - Clay

******LINE EXTENSION ESTIMATE******

JOB NAME WILLIAMS MITCHELL DATE: 121306
DISTRICT PALATKA
ENGINEER KEH
W.O. # 0
J.O. # 0

I. Line Extension Cost $6,199.66

II. Revenue Credit

A. Residential Estimated kWh Based on Square Footage of Home

		FOOTAGE	EST. KWH/MTH
Lights only	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Lights/Water Heater	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Water Heater/A.C.	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Water Heater/Heat	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Water Heater/A.C./Heat ..	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Water Heater/Heat Pump ..	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Lights/A.C.	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Lights/Heat	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Lights/A.C./Heat	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Lights/Heat Pump	sq.ft.=	0.00	0.00
Other (Est. Monthly kWh).....			0.00
ESTIMATED AVERAGE MONTHLY KWh			0.00

B. Commercial Estimated kWh Based on Load Anaylsis

ESTIMATED AVERAGE MONTHLY KWh 90.00

C. Revenue Credit

TOTAL ESTIMATED AVERAGE MONTHLY kWh 90.00

REVENUE CREDIT (48 mths @ $.06077/kWh/mth).. $262.53

III. Charge to Consumer

TOTAL LINE COST	$6,199.66
TOTAL REVENUE CREDIT	($262.53)
TOTAL COST TO CONSUMER	$5,937.13

PAY TAXES ON THIS AMT.

IV. Monthly Charge

MONTHLY CHARGE (10 YRS @ 6.2%) $66.51

-1

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

FIFTH DISTRICT

SEMINOLE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,INC.

Appellant

vs

CASE NUMBER

5D07-3005

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,

Appellee

---/

BRIEF OF AMICI CURAIE MITCHELL WILLIAMS IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEE

1. As a Friend of the Court Mitchell Williams believes that he can be of real value in resolving the instant case. His intrest is as a buyer of services provided by the Appellant through their subcontractor Clay Electric Cooperative.

2. Lay persons not well instructed oftimes have a hard time understanding issues of THERMODYNAMICS because as with aerodynamics,hydrodynamics, and other physical sciences 2 plus 2 do not always add up to 4, Sometimes an engineer has to be happy when they only add up to 1.2. This is because of losses caused by friction,and other drags on efficiency in a real world.

3. The Court should notice that this case is one that really does confirm the fact that truth can sometimes be stranger than fiction.

4. The events that would eventually bring this case before this Court started one day in November of 2005 at a piece of land in Putnam County called the Mondex (a failed real estate project). Mitchell Williams was out feeding his goats,as he does most days,and looking at all the dead trees scattered about when he had a GOOD IDEA.

5. Mr. Williams, who is a talented selftaught aircraft engineer, of many years standing, knew full well that he had a a really hot idea. He has always subscribed to the definition of an engineer as someone that "can do with $100 what any fool can do with $1000."

6. He imediately called Mr. Anthony at the Palatka Daily News and told him that he had a really big story for him. After hearing a brief discription Mr. Anthony said" that does sound pretty intresting and we would certainly consider printing that as a letter to the editor if you could send it in." Mr. Williams told him that he would recieve it shortly. A copy is included in this brief as Appendix A.

7. On the same day Mr. Williams telephoned several persons at Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc in Palatka and Tampa. These contacts were documented in a letter he sent to Mr. Baez who is director of the Florida Public Service Commisson. A copy of this letter is included in this brief as Appendix B.

8. After this nothing happened for several months until one day Mr. Williams learned that Seminole Electric Cooperative Inc. was seeking to get support from the Govenor and public agencies to build a third coal fired power plant in Putnam County. His reaction was that Seminole Electric was not being smart about this problem. He sent a letter to the Govenor urging him to delay the third power plant. A copy of this letter is included as Appendix C.

9. So the Court can see that if Seminole Electric had started burning the customers waste wood in 2005 everyone would love them and they could build to their hearts content.

As it is, Seminole Electric is fast aground on the rocks of their plan's deficiency to meet the 21st Century goals of pollution reduction and environmental protection. Make no mistake, coal is a most excellent source of energy that can compete directly with oil, mainly because there is a lot more of it. However burning it just as it comes from the ground is very wasteful and highly polluting. Now, we have to worry about Al Gore melting the icecaps with the smoke. Seminole Electric needs a whole new set of plans to convert their present plants into the 21st Century reality of high efficiency, low polluting coal. Here is how it is done. Coal still comes in by rail, but now there is also huge piles of customer wood chips. All of this is fed into large cokeing ovens and then is fed directly without cooling into the gasifiers that fuel the furnaces. The cokeing ovens and the gasifiers use 95% oxygen and NOT air. Because of the cokeing ovens the plant will have a long list of coal byproducts that can be sold to help defray production. These byproducts will include, but not be limited to, tar, benzene, methanol, styrene coal gas and others. The only thing actually used as fuel in the gasifiers would be the coke and charcoal. Here is where the superheated steam comes in. LOTS OF IT to provide a large percentage of the fuel load being water split by hot carbon. This whole operation will cut the coal fuel load per kilwatt hour produced, possibly in half. That means half the amount of CO_2 going into the atmosphere. And you need to remember that the carbon from wood causes no net gain in greenhouse gases because it is part of the continous cycle of

growth of green plants. To the extent that the powerplants use wood they are solar powered. The only thing needed to get the plant efficiency way up is to burn the producer gas with pure oxygen. There would be two more,important,byproducts produced by all these processes. Liquid Nitrogen and hot water. The liquid nitrogen will have a ready market as a high quality refridgerant,and propellant. the hot water will not be very useful as winters are not cold enough in Florida, and bathouses and laundrys could not use it all up.If the powerplants were located on the coast this hot water could be used to convert a fair quantity of sea water into fresh. Where the powerplants are located,about the most that can be done with it would be to vacume flash off the steam and run it through a low pressure turbine to recover a portion of the energy in the water. This gets the existing powerplants up to par but if more power is needed what is required is basicly an earthbound rocket. Liquid oxygen is used with methanol and water to drive a turboalternator rig. The whole thing would be slightly larger than a pair of boxcars. Is this new technology? NO it is just the same sort of thing as the old German V2 rockets. The Appellant is very likely to concede to every point Mr. Williams has presented here but raise the specter of excessive cost. The Court should also consider that a new powerplant cannot be built for free. Also the cost of power must be calculated to include the value of the byproducts produced,which could be significant. Liquid nitrogen by itself could replace a LOT of electricity wasted to run air conditioners.

10. Because the Appellant's plan is just a Blast from the Past this Court should deny the appeal but not forbid them to offer a better plan in the future.

11. Mr. Williams hopes that this Court has found this brief to be intresting reading. If so the Court will find as Appendix D. a series of essays on this and closely related issues. The CRYO ENGINE was first published in 1974 but the rest are recent.These are included free at no extra cost.

Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams Amici Pro Se
1707 Rutland Ave
Palatka,Fl 32177

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FIFTH DISTRICT

SEMINOLE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,INC.

Appellant

vs

CASE NUMBER

5D07-3005

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Appellee

---/

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that I have sent a copy of the attached BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE MITCHELL WILLIAMS to the parties to this action addressed to;

SEMINOLE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,INC., 890 N. Highway 17
Palatka,Fl 32177

Florida Department of Environmental Protection
3900 Commonwealth Blvd. MS 49 Tallahassee,Florida 32399

Sent by U.S. Mail this 6 day of DEC. 2007.

Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams Pro Se
1707 Rutland Ave.
Palatka,Fl 32177
386 329-8603

This issue is now pending in FLA. Courts

OPINIONS

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Burn trees at power plant

My proposal is to allow electric customers to pay up to half of their electric bill with dead (or live) trees growing in their yard.

Almost anything that burns could be burned in Seminole's coal burning power station. That includes dried goat manure, leaves, mowings and trees.

Seminole Electric Co-op officials are balking at the proposal. Their objections are: coal is dirt cheap and we already have the equipment to use it; wood produces more smoke (they do not allege that wood has more sulfur); we will need to get special permission from the EPA.

Any person or business that has an account with the power companies could gather up yard waste and take it to the power plant (or a managed collection point). There it would be weighed and graded (dry fuels that are clean are valued higher than green fuels that are dirty).

The power plant would chip it all up and blow it into the furnaces. The client would be credited with the reasonable value to the fuel toward future electric bills. After a bad storm, some clients would be able to pay 50 percent of their bills for a year in advance.

Such a system would start up a lot of cottage industries. Young guys would go around cutting up waste trees and taking them to the power plants for other people.

As I see it, the biggest problem the electric companies will have is that they will need to get used to actually meeting the customers almost every day. It is truly absurd to force Florida residents to pay for Middle East oil, Virginia coal or Texas gas when al the fuel they need is rotting in their own back yard.

MITCHELL WILLIAMS
~~East Palatka~~
1907 RUTLAND AVE
PALATKA, FL 32177
386 546-3222
FORMER CANDIDATE FOR MAYOR OF ATLANTA + GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA

ADDRESSED TO DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FLA.

POB 57 E.Palatka,fl 32137
December 1,2005
386 546-3222

SUBJECT:SERIOUS PROPOSAL TO THE COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Baez;

One of your staff members suggested that I submit the following issue to you as a proposal rather than as a complaint. This seems reasonable.

About one month ago an idea occured to me that doubtless will have earthshaking effects on electric power production in Florida.

I imediately called the director of the local Seminole Power Co-op plant in Palatka and started to explain it to him.In just a few seconds he said"Woa! Your talking way over my head. You need to talk with the fuel purchaseing department in Tampa!"Then I called the head office and shortly had a young man on the line whose name I should have written down, as I still don't know who he was. This is about what I told him;

"You know something you really ought to start doing? You ought to start allowing electric power customers to pay up to 50% of their power bills with dead wood out of their own backyard. Right now such things are a dead waste and after storms (this was before Wilma pased through)there is an awful lot of it. This is a renewable energy source produced directly by fusion(from the Sun). You will only need to get a couple of those tree size wood chippers and you could feed it directly into any fuel burning plant imediately."

His response was that there would probably be a problem with smoke,because the only fuel that is really popular is natural gas. However after a couple of minutes he said that he needed to present this idea to his board of directors,and would I mind if he used my name to bring up the subject. I said that this was no problem.

After one week he had still not called me back, so I called again tryin to reach him. I had come up with a solution to his problem with burning wood in gas burning plants.That solution of course,is gas generators to convert the wood to gas before burning it. As I did not remember his name I did not know who to ask for.

APP. B
Appendix 2

However I was directed to Jack Reed who is in charge of that department .I explained the proposal all over again to him and there followed a long list of his objections,which he seemed, were conclusive. All his objections were to the idea of using wood as a fuel in the plants, and how the EPA would never give permission for it. Before ending the call I let it be known that this was not the last he would hear about it.

Such objections cannot hold water. Electric power production with biomass is a well understood fact. There are 100% wood burning plants in the Big Timber regions up North,and many others that use certain percentages of wood. In Ireland they burn dried peat in the power stations.Even here in Palatka the Georgia Pacific papermill,that is within sight of the Seminole coal fired plant,produces all its power with wood waste.

The only thing new with my proposal was HOW the plant gets its fuel. Against such a suggestion there can be no argument. As soon as it becomes known that one can pay 50% of ones electric bill with waste wood the trucks will start lining up at the gates.

The real problem with this proposal is not technical it is human.People who like to think of themselves as electric power gods are going to come down to the fact that they are just a bunch of proffessional trash burners. Any perks that were supplied by their fuel contractors will disappear.Zenophobic officials who could boast that they had NEVER spoken to a single customer will not be welcome. Instead it is going to beWELCOME TO THE WALMART OF POWER GENERATION,YOU BRING IT,WE BURN IT!

It doesn't look like any power company is goin to react to this proposal as they should "Hey this is a terrific idea.Lets get started right away..". Because of that the Public Service Commission will doubtless need to "REQUEST" that they provide a detailed plan in 30 days on how they expect to motivate their customers to supply them with the needed biomass to operate their power plants.It may help to "INFORM" them that after 60 days they will only be allowed to spend the customers money to buy other fuels if biomass doesn't arrive in sufficient quantity to feed the furnaces.

The only new work they will need to do is to establish manned collection points at the plants and convenient locations. There they need to weigh and grade the incoming biomass and credit the customers accounts.

This commission will need to establish a standard value (corrected quarterly) for 100 lbs. of air dried(15% moisture) biomass that is clean. 100 lbs of air dried wood is about the same as 100 lbs of airdried hay, leaves or cow chips. Cities will want to supply all their waste trimmings and dried sewage sludge,and it will be welcome. The power companies will not be "OBLIGED" to recieve any glass,metal,plastic,dirty motor oil,tires,wood with nails in it or fuels with excessive dirt. High moisture biomass will get a much reduced value as fuel and the power companies should be allowed to turn away fuel with more than 30% moisture or excessive dirt. This will stop people coming with truckloads of fresh cabbage trimmings and other high moisture fuels.

It won't take me long to load up a truckload of nicely dried goat manure (about the same as dried peat) and get it to the plant here in Palatka,after the orders of this commission go out.

ALSO-RAN candidate for mayor of Atlanta (1989 + 1992)
Governor of Georgia
1990, 1994, + 2001

Yours Truly

Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams

PS; Acourtsey copy of this letter has been sent to Jack Reed at Seminole Power Co-op in Tampa and Florida Power in Juno Beach.
Jack Reed can be reached at 813 963-0994.
Joan Fillion's number at Fla. Power in Juno Beach is 561 691-7820 however this number seems to be a trick number whose messages are not answered unless it is the Governor or President calling.

1707 RUTLAND AVE.
Mitchell Williams
~~104 Waxwing~~
Palatka,Fl 32177
386 546-3222
Sept.4 2006

Dear Governor Bush;

I suggest that you put an imediate hold on the construction of the third coal plant by Seminole Electric Co-op in Palatka at this time. This is 2006 not 1936.I assume that the design is a familer one that any plant manager in 1936 would recognize(Babcock&Willcox,turboalternators with reheat etc.) Only the computer control room would look new.Same old low efficiency antique stuff.

In its place they should be allowed to build a 21 Century plant and get Florida ahead of(not behind) California.

Here is what is needed. A coke fired furnace(no scrubber needed)using 95% pure oxygen for combustion.To keep the gasifier cool enough to prevent melting, a heavy injection of superheated steam would be mixed with the stream of pure oxygen. At these temperatures (1800° F. plus) steam reduces the carbon to carbon monoxide and the hydrogen is released to BURN AGAIN. Meaning that the plant runs partly on water. Possibly as much as 25% of the fuel could be water injected as superheated steam. This same trick can be used with a hot, air breathing furnace but the inert gases in the air prevent full efficiency of the process, and only 2 or 3% of the fuel can be water.

By using oxygen,coke,and steam you might reduce the total coke consumption by nearly half for the same power output. Meaning the exhaust from the plant would have half ~~much~~ AS much CO_2 (reduced greenhouse gases) and no nitrous oxides at all.

Since you then would have a really hot fire at your fingertips you might as well go whole hog in optimizeing the design.

Throw out all the steam pipes except the ones to supply the steam to the gasifier. In their place substitute a closed cycle gas turbine with helium or CO_2 as the working fluid. All this shrinks down the entire plant to a fraction of its original size.

APP. C

Appendix 2

It also might be built much faster with modified jet, rocket, and refridgeration parts.

Making all this oxygen at the plant will mean they will have rivers of surplus liquid nitrogen and hot water to sell for cooling and heating purposes. This could help reduce the waste of electricity for these purposes.

And the fuel efficiency of the plant should be VERY HIGH.This same trick can be done with any fuel burning plant that has a high carbon content in the fuel(wood,oil,sewage sludge, goat manure etc.). It will be less effective with natural gas as there is less carbon in it,so only a reduced amount of water can be burned with it. However,pure oxygen can also greatly increase the efficiency of any fuel burning plant by eleminateing the inert gases from the system.Convection heat is greatly reduced, and radiant heat is greatly increased making even steam plants much smaller for a given output.

If you should have any doubts concerning what is presented here you can ask any of the rocket people at the Cape. They are allways quick to tell you how the turbopumps on the Space Shuttle Main Engines (about the size of outboard motors) produce 100,000 horsepower each,and could easily light a small city.

FORMER CANDIDATE FOR MAYOR OF ATLANTA (2 TIMES) GOVENOR OF GEORGIA (3 TIMES) Mitchell Williams

Mitchell Williams

c.c. Fla.Public Service Commission,Dept.of Environmental Protection, Seminole Electric Co-op. and Palatka Daily News,Fla.Senate,